[29th October 1935

*Solitary confinement of Mr. Kalayya Chetti, a prisoner convicted in the Madras Conspiracy Case.*

* 223 *Q.*—Mrs. A. Rukmani Lakshmipathi: Will the Hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Mr. Kalayya Chetti, a prisoner of the Madras Conspiracy Case, was charged with some jail offence and accordingly sentenced;

(*b*) if so, what the charge was; and

(*c*) whether it is a fact that Mr. Kalayya Chetti is kept in solitary confinement and consequently his health has been affected?

*A.*—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Wilfully refusing to eat food prescribed by the prison diet scale.

(*c*) The answer to both parts of the question is in the negative.

*Classification of Mr. Devanayagayya as a 'C' class prisoner.*

* 224 *Q.*—Mrs. A. Rukmani Lakshmipathi: Will the Hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Mr. Devanayagayya, convicted for sedition in the recent Tinnevelly sedition case, has been awarded 'C class'; and

(*b*) what the reasons are for giving Mr. Devanayagayya 'C' class?

*A.*—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) The convict was classified as a "C" class prisoner by the convicting Magistrate with reference to the provisions in rule 747-A of the Jail Manual.

Mr. C. Basu Dev:—"May I ask whether the Government will consider the desirability of removing the class distinctions at least among the convicts? We have enough class distinctions already."

The Hon. Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu:—"It is only among the convicts that there is this class distinction."

## Control of Books and Printing Presses

*Reasons for demanding security from the "Prabhat," a Karnataka weekly of South Kanara.*

* 225 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: Will the Hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that a Karnataka weekly of South Kanara called the "Prabhat" was asked to deposit a security of Rs. 2,000; if so, in respect of which article the security was demanded;

(*b*) whether he will be pleased to place on the table a copy of the offensive portion of the said article; and

(*c*) what provision of the Press Act the article offends and how?

29th October 1935]

*A.*—(*a*) Yes; the security was demanded in respect of an article published on 23rd June 1935 commenting on the relief measures at Quetta. As the publisher offered an unqualified apology the notice demanding the security has since been withdrawn.

(*b*) A translation of the article is appended. [a]

(*c*) Clause (*d*) of sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Indian Press (Emergency Powers) Act, 1931, as amended by section 16 of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1932; the article tends to bring the Government into hatred and contempt.

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT :—" May I ask whether bona fide criticism of the conduct of the Government is what is meant by bringing the Government into hatred and contempt? "

The Hon. Rao Bahadur A. T. PANNIRSELVAM :—" I cannot give legal opinion sitting here."

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT :—" May I ask whether there was anything beyond bona fide criticism in the article supposed to have given offence? "

The Hon. Rao Bahadur A. T. PANNIRSELVAM :—" If it was merely bona fide criticism security would not have been demanded."

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT :—" Is it the idea that there should be no criticism on the action of the Government? "

The Hon. Rao Bahadur A. T. PANNIRSELVAM :—" No sensible Government would be of that opinion."

*Demand of securities from newspapers and presses for publication of articles concerning the Quetta Earthquake Relief.*

* 226 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT : Will the Hon. the Home Member be pleased to state with reference to the working of the Press Act in this Presidency since the date of the Quetta Earthquake, the number of presses, newspapers and periodicals which have been called upon to furnish security for articles concerning the Quetta Earthquake and its relief and also the amount so demanded?

*A.*—A statement [b] is attached.

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT :—" May I know if there is any other paper which dealt with Quetta, but did not merit the order of the Government in the matter of security? "

The Hon. Rao Bahadur A. T. PANNIRSELVAM :—" The Hon. Member may make the question a little plainer."

[a] Printed as Appendix I on pages 104–105 infra.

[b] Printed as Appendix II on page 105 infra.